

11 May 1980

TINACC is a publication dealing with IDA/NA Council stuff. It is edited and published by Rod Walker, "Alcala", 1273 Crest Dr., Encinitas CA 92024. This is Pandemonium Publication #695.

ITEM I

As many of you already know, Eric, Scott, and I met with Jerry Jones last Tuesday in Pasadena. Our discussion centered around Eric's proposals, and my supplemental proposals, for salvaging IDA.

I regret to report that our conclusion was, unanimously, negative. That is, after considering many plans and alternatives, and all of the available evidence, we concluded that it is not possible to save IDA. Jerry, whose many readers are quite vocal in letters, calls, and even visits, knows that the very name, IDA, is anathema throughout the hobby. Anyone who gets any of the hobby press knows that there is no editor today who supports the organization. During the past year I've been one of IDA's most active advocates, and I confess that I am hard-pressed to provide any real justification for its continued existence.

Changing the name, changing the structure, changing the people... all of the suggested palliatives of the past will not work. Under any name or guise, people would know it's just the IDA trying again, and we are now in such bad odor in the hobby that all the hype in the world will not save us. I had no idea how bad it was until this meeting made me take a hard look at my own wishful thinking.

I must therefore now agree with those who say it is best for IDA just to die quietly. This is a complete reversal of my previous position but the evidence leaves me no alternative. I suppose the NADF, as several people have urged, can pick up whatever loose ends might need tending to.

The suggestion has been made that IDA would then turn its treasury over to NADF. I oppose this idea. This is money collected primarily from the players of the hobby, and I would hope they would benefit more directly from it.

There is, luckily, an available alternative. The upcoming issue of DIPLOMACY WORLD is going to implement Jerry Jones' idea of an organization of the players, run by the players for the players. This will be something of an informal affair, to be called the Diplomacy Players' Association. Jerry will be the non-voting Chairman (Moderator, some such title) of a council of 4 players selected on a volunteer basis. The purpose of DPA will be to act as a sort of union for Diplomacy players...to encourage players to stick up for themselves and their rights, to represent the players' viewpoints, and to support player-oriented projects. There will probably be no constitution. The only actual officer, aside from Jerry, will be a non-voting Treasurer, and I understand Eric is to serve in that capacity. This is where our money should go.

I therefore propose the following motions:

B80.19: The IDA Council bequeaths the IDA treasury to Eric Verheiden as trustee/treasurer for the Diplomacy Players' Association, effective immediately.

B80.20: The IDA Council will close its books on 31 December 1980.

B80.21: The Council instructs the President to insert in Diplomacy publications of general circulation a notice that any person with a claim on IDA funds for services performed must contact Eric Verheiden prior to 1 October 1980. All reimbursements previously authorized by

this Council will automatically be made. All other requested reimbursements will be referred to this Council for approval. The notice must state that requests for reimbursement must include a detailed accounting of the basis for the request. Funds remaining in the IDA treasury after 31 December 1980 will become the exclusive property of the Diplomacy Players' Association. Prior to that date, requests for reimbursement to DPA must be approved by this Council before they can be made.

B80.22: Except for purposes stated in B80.21, the business of this Council is declared to be at an end, effective 30 June 1980. With the exception of such purposes, this Council will, on 1 July 1980, be adjourned sine die. As of that date, this Council delegates to Eric Verheiden any powers necessary to poll the Council pursuant to the provisions of B80.21.

I request that votes on these measures be sent to the President by 10 June 1980. I would also like to request that a carbon copy of your votes be sent to me, please, as a confirmation measure. If you wish, you may send your original votes to me by 3 June 1980 and I will forward them to Robert.

ITEM II

I have at hand a letter from Elmer Hinton, dated 5 May, written in the usual warm and friendly style he effects with someone who has had the temerity to call attention to his faults. You probably have this, or will get it, since he seems to send out reams of copies of these things in the mistaken belief that everyone will instantly join the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Hinton.

Amid all the egoistic argle-bargle, Elmer discusses some points I made in TINACC 5. Well, let's see:

1. Elmer alleges two precedents for the pretended power of any Council member to "shelve" bills. Both involve Presidents, so one smells the rat right away. In one instance (1979) Acting President Fred Davis tabled all pending motions so the Council could consider them at DipCon XII. In doing so he had the explicit or implicit consent of every member of the Council (with the possible exception of Hinton). In the other instance (1978) Bob Hartwig tabled a motion to reimburse the BNC--again, apparently, with at least the implicit consent of the Council. This is a fair cry from Elmer Hinton shelving a motion whether the Council members want it or not. The precedents show only that the President, with the consent of the Council, can table motions. B80.3 and 4 have been properly introduced, debated, voted on, and (apparently) passed. End of subject--unless, of course, Elmer wishes to exercise the perfectly legitimate right of introducing new bills.

2. Elmer claimed in his massive missive (p. 12) that the IDA President was paid for CC last year. I said this was not so. "You lie," says Elmer, and to prove it says that Hartwig was reimbursed for the Census. Now, I know the Census is not Council Courier, even though they begin with the same letter, but perhaps Elmer is confused. He then says Hartwig was reimbursed for CC year before last, which is true enough. So what?

3. I made no statement that my letter "of 5 Feb did not in any way concern IDA". I said that my personal correspondence is not under the jurisdiction of IDA and I was under no obligation to furnish copies to anyone. Elmer says the first statement is false; it is, but I didn't make it. Elmer, don't you read English?

4. Finally Elmer says he doesn't have to submit a detailed accounting of his expenses in order to be reimbursed for DR 79.1. Well, now, anyone with even a modicum of a brain would perceive that if you want to be reimbursed for an expense, you submit an expense account. You shouldn't have to be told that. I submit that the real reason behind Elmer's reluctance to submit such an accounting is that he doubts his ability to fake one that adds up to the outrageous total of \$25.00 and still stand any degree of scrutiny...which, I assure you Elmer, it will get.

There is a conjoined issue. Elmer combined DR with his private 'zine, KAISSA. He will no doubt try to stick us with x copies at x bucks apiece. I insist that our actual liability is only the prorated printing cost for the DR portion of the 'zines actually mailed to our members plus the postage for those individuals who didn't already receive KAISSA, and are IDA members. Elmer will no doubt think that is not enough. I think his figure is outrageously high. [I'm beginning to sound like good old outraged Bob Sacks.] Anyway, there is no way to settle on any figure until we know what the actual costs were.

And until Elmer gives us a complete and detailed cost breakdown, I submit we cannot authorize reimbursement. We would be absolute fools to authorize such an obviously arbitrary figure as \$25.00. I will continue to vote against any such authorization, and I urge you all to do likewise, until Elmer meets his obligation to provide us with facts instead of baloney.

ITEM III

Although there is no time limit on production of CC, it would appear that Robert has not produced one within a reasonable time after 28 April. I am therefore going to summarize the votes as I know them to be or can extrapolate from communications received. Until and unless Robert meets his obligation to announce the results, I suggest we treat these as official.

	80.1	80.2	80.2A	80.3	80.4	80.3/4A	80.5	80.6	80.7	80.8
HINTON	Y	Y	Y	D	D	D	N	Y	Y	N
MARLEY	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
RICCI	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	?
SACKS	D	N	Y	N	N	Y	D	D	D	Y
VERHEIDEN	D	N	N	Y	Y	N	D	Y	Y	N
WALKER	D	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
WHITE	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	D	D	D	N

PASS PASS FAIL PASS PASS FAIL DEB. PASS PASS FAIL

Some of Robert's "D" votes are based on his statement that if anyone objected to certain of the bills, he would want to hear more discussion...which seems to be a "debate" vote. On the basis of that, B805 seems to be carried over for debate. I assume Robert will, when he gets around to it, set a new voting deadline for that one. However, most of this may be academic in view of my proposals in Item I. I have already notified Dick Martin that he should send in a request for reimbursement if appropriate. I assume Robert will take any actions made necessary by the other measures and which he thinks appropriate.